REMARKS

By the present invention, Claim 1 has been amended, Claims 4-6 have been canceled, and Claims 7-9 have been newly added. Claims 1-3 and 7-9 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, and introduce no new matter therewith. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Office noted that the terms "flexible" and "metal thin film" in claims 1, 4 and 5 and 6 are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. The cancellation of Claims 4-6 renders this rejection moot with respect to these particular claims. Applicants have amended Claim 1 by deleting the term "flexible." Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e) Rejection based on Myers et al.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e) as allegedly being anticipated by Myers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0185199 A1 or U.S. Patent No.

US 6,929,705 B2). The cancellation of Claims 4-6 renders this rejection moot with respect to these particular claims. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites a heat radiating sheet including a heat absorbing layer, a heat radiating layer, and an adhesive layer. The heat absorbing layer has heat conductivity with a thickness from 0.3 mm to 1 mm. The heat radiating film is formed on the front surface of the heat absorbing layer with a thickness from 0.1 mm to 0.15 mm and has the effect of radiating infrared rays. The adhesive layer includes a heat conductive adhesive agent and is formed on the rear surface of the heat absorbing layer for attaching the heat absorbing layer to a heat generator. The heat radiating sheet has flexibility.

Myers et al. describes an antimicrobial coated metal sheet. Both sides of the metal sheet are coated. The present invention distinguishes from this because one side of the metallic sheet is coated, and the other side of the metallic film includes a heat conductive adhesive and a heat conductive tape to fix the metallic sheet.

In Myers et al., the coating material includes inorganic antibacterial particles, and acts as a barrier for pollution. As described in the present application, for example, the heat radiating layer 3 is a coating material that has the effect of converting heat into far infrared rays and radiating to the outside, thereby cooling a surface to which the heat radiating sheet 1 is attached (see, e.g., Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application). Accordingly, the coating material and the coated metallic sheet are different between Myers et al. and the present invention.

As further described in the application, for example, the adhesive layer 4 is a layer to adhere the heat absorbing layer 2 to an external surface 5, such as a heat generator, and is

different from the antimicrobial coating in Myers et al. While Myers et al. describes pre-treating the metal substrate 12 at step 50 of Fig. 2 with an interlayer that can be an adhesive coating (see Myers et al. Figs. 1 and 2; col. 5, lines 59 to col. 6, line 58), this interlayer is to enhance the adhesion of the coating composition after curing, not to facilitate adhesion of a heat radiating sheet to an external surface. Accordingly, the adhesive layer in the present invention is different from the lower layer of sheet metal 10 in Myers et al.

There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention for a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e). The application of Myers et al. by the Office fails to meet this criteria, and amended Claim 1 is allowable over Myers et al.

Claims 2 and 3 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In addition, Myers et al. nowhere describes an emulsion compound containing kaolin, as recited in dependent Claim 3.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e) as being anticipated by Myers et al.

Added Claims

3. Newly added Claim 7 is similar to Claim 1 and is similarly allowable over Myers et al.

Claims 8 and 9 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Conclusion

4. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

January 4, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.
Registration No. 41,289
Thomas C. Schoeffler
Registration No. 43,385
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-8300
Attorney for Applicant

MAS/TCS